SENSITIVE FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

2011 APR -8 AM 9: 46

2	201 M3 -8 A 10: 20		
3	- 110 20	CELA	
4	In the Matter of)	
5) DISMISSAL AND CASE	
6	MUR 6333) CLOSURE UNDER THE	
7	LOWRY FOR CONGRESS AND) ENFORCEMENT PRIORITY	
8	RUTH WEISS BELL, AS TREASURER) SYSTEM	
9	ROBERT PAUL LOWRY)	
10	CHRIS LEGGATT)	
11 12	GENERAL COUNSEL'S REPORT		
13	Under the Enforcement Priority System ("EPS"), the Commission uses formal		
14	scoring criteria to allocate its resources and decide which cases to pursue. These criteria		
15	include, but are not limited to, an assessment of (1) the gravity of the alleged violation,		
16	both with respect to the type of activity and the amount in violation, (2) the apparent		
17	impact the alleged violation may have had on the electoral process, (3) the legal		
18	complexity of issues raised in the case, (4) recent trends in potential violations of the Act,		
19	and (5) development of the law with respect to certain subject matters. It is the		
20	Commission's policy that pursuing low-rated matters, compared to other higher-rated		
21	matters on the Enforcement docket, warrants the exercise of its prosecutorial discretion to		
22	dismiss certain cases. The Office of General Counsel has scored MUR 6333 as a low-rated		
23	matter and has also determined that it should not be referred to the Alternative Dispute		
24	Resolution Office. This Office therefore recommends that the Commission exercise its		
25	prosecutorial discretion to dismiss MUR 6333.		
26	In this matter, the complainant, Scott Vrabel, alleges that candidate Robert Paul		
27	Lower this compaign committee Lower for Congress and Duth Weign Bell in her official		

Mr. Lowry unsuccasufully sought to represent Florida's 20th Congressional District.

- 1 capacity as treasurer² ("the Committee"), and Mr. Lowry's campaign manager, Chris
- 2 Leggatt, committed two separate violations of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971,
- 3 as amended ("the Act"), and the underlying Commission regulations. First, the
- 4 complainant asserts that, according to the Committee's financial disclosure reports, it
- 5 accepted four \$220 contributions from the following corporations: Delwood Management
- 6 Company, Inc. on October 19, 2009; Homefield Advantage Public Adjusters on October
- 7 15, 2009; Jim Mclean Enterprises, Inc. on November 30, 2009; and Lamar 1 Hour Dry
- 8 Cleaners, Inc. on October 20, 2009. Thus, the Committee allegedly accepted a total of
- 9 \$880 in contributions from corporations, in violation of 2 U.S.C. § 441b(a).
- Second, the complainant maintains that "on numerous occasions," the Lowry
- campaign "has published and disseminated banners that lack the disclaimer 'Paid for by
- 12 Lowry for Congress." Appended to the complaint are what appear to be photographs of
- 13 banners that include the phrases "Lowry for Congress" and "United States Congress
- 14 District 20," but which do not include disclaimers stating that the Committee had paid for
- the banner or banners, as required by 2 U.S.C. § 441d(a) and 11 C.F.R. §§ 110.11(a) and
- 16 (b)(1).
- 17 Committee treasurer Ruth Bell filed two responses, one day apart, on behalf of the
- Lowry respondents. In her first response, an email dated March 29, 2011, Ms. Bell states
- that the banner at issue had included the disclaimer "Paid for by Lowry for Congress," and

According to the Committee's filings, Jeremy David Anderson served as the Committee's treasurer during the events discussed herein.

According to its website, Homefield Advantage Public Adjusters is incorporated within the State of Florida. See http://www.corporationwiki.com/Florida/Pembroke-Pines/homefield-advantage-public-adjusters-inc-2240919.aspx.

1 that photographs of the banner had been provided to the Federal Election Commission

2 ("Commission") along with a letter from campaign manager Chris Leggatt. Ms. Bell

3 included a copy of Mr. Leggatt's correspondence, dated August 20, 2010, which states that

4 a single banner had been purchased "during the exploratory time," prior to the State of

5 Florida's official designation of Mr. Lowry as a candidate, and that "this single banner

6 proudly displays 'Paid for by Lowry for Congress.'" Mr. Leggatt's correspondence also

7 refers to an accompanying photograph of the banner but, after reviewing our records, it

8 does not appear that the Commission received either Mr. Leggatt's correspondence or the

9 photograph.4

Initially, Mr. Leggatt's August 20, 2010 letter and Ms. Bell's March 29, 2011 email indicate that refund checks had been issued to the four corporations described in the complaint. However, in a subsequent email, dated March 30, 2011, Ms. Bell acknowledges that the refund checks had not yet been issued. She explains that the candidate, Mr. Lowry was arranging to make a loan to his campaign, presumably to cover the costs of the refunds, and would thereafter issue refund checks to the corporations that had made a total of \$880 in contributions. Ms. Bell states that the loan and the corporate refunds will be reflected on the Committee's 2011 April Quarterly Report, which is due to

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

¹⁸

The Committee's response indicates that the campaign manager responded to the complaint on August 20, 2010, however, there is no record of this Office receiving the response. The Committee's Treasurer has provided a copy of the letter in her response dated March 29, 2011.

The Committee's most recently-filed financial disclosure report, its 2010 October Quarterly Report, shows that the Committee had cash on hand of only \$328.99.

7

8

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1 be filed on April 15, 2011.6

2 It appears from the complaint attachments that the Committee may have failed to

3 include a proper disclaimer on its campaign banner. 11 C.F.R. §§ 110.11(a) and (b)(1).

4 Moreover, the disclaimer would have required a box surrounding the text. See 11 C.F.R.

5 §§ 110.11(c)(2)(ii). However, the Committee avers that it has a picture that shows the

6 banner with the required disclaimer. Although the Committee claims that it has previously

provided this Office with a picture of the banner showing the appropriate disclaimer, this

Office has not received the response. Finally, the Committee has admitted to accepting

9 contributions from corporations and has taken remedial action by refunding the

10 contributions.

Even assuming arguendo that the banner lacked a disclaimer, it appears that the banner identified in the picture submitted by the complainant included sufficient identifying information, such as the Committee's website and Committee logo, that it was unlikely that the general public would have been confused about whether it was associated with the Lowry campaign. Additionally, although the Committee accepted corporate contributions, the amount involved is relatively small (\$880) and the Committee has taken remedial action by disclosing and refunding the sontributions at issue. Accordingly, under EPS, the Office of General Counsel has scored MUR 6333 as a low-rated matter and, therefore, in furtherance of the Commission's priorities as discussed above, the Office of General Counsel believes that the Commission should exercise its prosecutorial discretion and dismiss this matter.

As indicated by Ms. Hell, the Committee filed its 2011 April Quarterly Report on April 8, 2011, which reflected over \$880 in refunds to corporations identified in the complaint.

34

Dismissal and Case Closure Under EPS - 6333 General Counsel's Report Page 5

1	<u>RECOMMENDATIONS</u>	
2 3	The Office of General Counsel recommends that the Commission dismiss	
4	MUR 6333, close the file, and approve the appropriate letters.	
5 6 7 8		Christopher Hughey Acting General Counsel
8 9 10 11	<u>4/ce/1/</u> BY:	Gregory R. Baker
12 13		Special Counsel Complaints Examination
14 15 16		& Legal Administration
17 18 19		Jeff S. Jordan
20		Supervisory Attorney
21		Complaints Examination
22 23		& Legal Administration
23 24)41 ///
25	-	let / July 2
26		Ruth Heilizer
27		Attorney
28		Complaints Examination
29 30		& Legal Administration
31		
32		
33		